arXiv:math/0702633v1 [math.QA] 22 Feb 2007

ON THE SEMISIMPLICITY OF THE CYCLOTOMIC BRAUER ALGEBRAS, II

HEBING RUI AND JIE XU

Abstract. In this paper, we give a necessary and sufficient condition for the semisimplicity of cyclotomic Brauer algebras $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ of types $G(m,1,n)$ with $m \geq 2$. This generalizes [11, 1.2–1.3] and [12, 2.5] on Brauer algebras.

Dedicated to Professor Gordon James on the occasion of his 60th birthday

1. Introduction

The cyclotomic Brauer algebras $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ have been introduced by Häring-Oldenburg in [10] as classical limits of cyclotomic Birman-Murakami-Wenzl algebras. When $m = 1$, they are Brauer algebras $\mathscr{B}_n(\delta)$ [2].

The main purpose of this paper is to give a necessary and sufficient condition for the semisimplicity of $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ under the assumption $m \geq 2$. For $m = 1$, such a criterion has been given in [11, 1.2-1.3] and [12, 2.5].

Unless otherwise stated, we assume that F is a splitting field of $x^m - 1$, which contains $\delta_i, 1 \leq i \leq m$. By assumption, there are $u_i \in F$ such that $x^m - 1 = \prod_{i=1}^m (x - u_i)$. Define

$$e = \begin{cases} +\infty, & \text{if } \operatorname{char} F = 0, \\ \operatorname{char} F, & \text{if } \operatorname{char} F > 0. \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

Following [12], we define $\mathbb{Z}_{m,n} = \{ma \mid a \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{m,n}\}$, where $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{m,n}$ is given as follows:

(1) $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{2,n} = \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{1,n} = \{k \in \mathbb{Z} \mid 3 - n \leq k \leq n - 3\} \cup \{2k - 3 \mid 3 \leq k \leq n, k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$.
(2) $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{m,n} = \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{1,n} \cup \{2 - n, n - 2\}$ if $m \geq 3$ and $n \geq 2$.

Suppose that $x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_m$ are indeterminates over F. If F contains ξ, a primitive m-th root of unity, then we define

$$\overline{x}_i = \sum_{j=1}^m x_j \xi^{ji}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq m - 1. \tag{1.2}$$

Note that F contains ξ if $e \nmid m$ [8, 8.2]. The following is the main result of this paper.

Theorem A. *Fix two positive integers m, n with $m > 1$. Let $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ be a cyclotomic Brauer algebra over F.*

(a) *Suppose $n \geq 2$. If $\delta_i \neq 0$ for some i, $0 \leq i \leq m - 1$, then $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ is (split) semisimple if and only if*

The first author was supported by NSFC No. 10331030 and NCET.

(1) *$e \nmid m \cdot n!$,*

(2) *$\varepsilon_{i,0}m - \overline{\delta}_i \notin \mathbb{Z}_{m,n}$, $0 \le i \le m-1$, where $\varepsilon_{i,0}$ is the Kronecker function.*

(b) *Suppose $n \ge 2$. If $\delta_i = 0$, $0 \le i \le m-1$, then $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\mathbf{0})$ is not (split) semisimple.*

(c) *$\mathscr{B}_{m,1}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ is (split) semisimple if and only if $e \nmid m$.*

In what follows, we write $\delta_j = \delta_i$ if $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $i \equiv j \mod m$.

Let $\mathscr{H}_{i,k}$ be the hyperplane in F^m, which is determined by the linear function $\varepsilon_{i,0}m - \overline{x}_i = k$, $0 \le i \le m-1$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{m,n}$. Condition (2) in Theorem A(a) is equivalent to the fact that $(\delta_0, \delta_1, \cdots, \delta_{m-1}) \notin \cup_{0 \le i \le m-1, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{m,n}} \mathscr{H}_{i,k}$. When $m = 1$, $\mathscr{H}_{i,k}$ collapses to a point in 1-dimensional F-space. This result has been proved in [11, 1.2-1.3] and [12, 2.5]. We remark that certain sufficient conditions for semisimplicity of complex Brauer algebras have been given in [3, 4, 14].

Our proof depends on Graham-Lehrer's theory on cellular algebras [6] and Doran-Wales-Hanlon's work [4, 3.3-3.4] on Brauer algebras. Let's explain the idea as follows.

In [6], Graham and Lehrer have introduced the notion of cellular algebra which is defined over a poset Λ. Such an algebra has a nice basis, called a cellular basis. For each $\lambda \in \Lambda$, one can define $\Delta(\lambda)$, called a cell module. Graham and Lehrer have shown that there is a symmetric, associative bilinear form ϕ_λ defined on $\Delta(\lambda)$. It has been proved in [6, 3.8] that a cellular algebra is (split) semisimple if and only if ϕ_λ is non-degenerate for any $\lambda \in \Lambda$. It is well known that a cellular algebra is split semisimple if and only if it is semisimple. Therefore, one can determine whether a cellular algebra is semisimple by deciding if all ϕ_λ are non-degenerate.

In [6], Graham-Lehrer have proved that a Brauer algebra $\mathscr{B}_n(\delta)$ over a commutative ring is a cellular algebra over the poset Λ which consists of all pairs (f, λ), with $0 \le f \le \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ and λ being a partition of $n - 2f$. Here $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ is the maximal integer which is less than $n/2$. Therefore, one can study the semisimplicity of $\mathscr{B}_n(\delta)$ by deciding whether $\phi_{f,\lambda}$ is non-degenerate or not for any $(f, \lambda) \in \Lambda$. Unfortunately, it is difficult to determine whether $\phi_{f,\lambda}$ is degenerate or not for a fixed (f, λ).

In [11], the first author has proved that the semisimplicity of $\mathscr{B}_n(\delta)$ is completely determined by $\phi_{f,\lambda}$ for all partitions λ of $n - 2f$ with $f = 0, 1$. Using [4, 3.3-3.4], he has decided whether such $\phi_{f,\lambda}$'s are degenerate or not in [11]. This gives a complete solution of the problem of semisimplicity of $\mathscr{B}_n(\delta)$ over an arbitrary field. This method will be used to study the semisimplicity of $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ in the current paper.

The contents of this paper are organized as follows. In section 2, we state some results on cyclotomic Brauer algebras, and complex reflection group $W_{m,2}$. In section 3, we describe explicitly the zero divisors of the discriminants for certain cell modules. Theorem A will be proved in section 4.

Acknowledgement: We thank the referee for his/her helpful comments.

2. Cyclotomic Brauer algebras

Let R be a commutative ring which contains the identity 1_R and $\delta_i, 1 \le i \le m$. The cyclotomic Brauer algebra $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ with parameters $\delta_i, 1 \le i \le m$, is the associative R-algebra which is free as R-module with basis which consists of all labelled Brauer diagrams [10]. $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ can also be defined as the R-algebra generated by $\{ s_i, e_i, t_j \mid 1 \le i < n \text{ and } 1 \le j \le n \}$ subject to the relations

a) $s_i^2 = 1$, for $1 \le i < n$.
b) $s_i s_j = s_j s_i$ if $|i-j| > 1$.
c) $s_i s_{i+1} s_i = s_{i+1} s_i s_{i+1}$,
for $1 \le i < n-1$.
d) $s_i t_j = t_j s_i$ if $j \ne i, i+1$.
e) $e_i^2 = \delta_0 e_i$, for $1 \le i < n$.
f) $s_i e_j = e_j s_i$, if $|i-j| > 1$.
g) $e_i e_j = e_j e_i$, if $|i-j| > 1$.
h) $e_i t_j = t_j e_i$, if $j \ne i, i+1$.
i) $t_i t_j = t_j t_i$, for $1 \le i, j \le n$.
j) $s_i t_i = t_{i+1} s_i$ for $1 \le i < n$.
k) $e_i s_i = e_i = s_i e_i$, for $1 \le i \le n-1$.
l) $s_i e_{i+1} e_i = s_{i+1} e_i$,
for $1 \le i \le n-2$.
m) $e_{i+1} e_i s_{i+1} = e_{i+1} s_i$,
for $1 \le i \le n-2$.
n) $e_i e_j e_i = e_i$ if $|i-j| = 1$.
o) $e_i t_i t_{i+1} = e_i = t_i t_{i+1} e_i$,
for $1 \le i < n$.
p) $e_i t_i^a e_i = \delta_a e_i$, for $1 \le a \le m-1$
and $1 \le i \le n-1$.
q) $t_i^m = 1$, for $1 \le i \le n$.

One can prove that the two definitions of $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ are equivalent by the arguments similar to those for Brauer algebras in [9].

The following result can be proved easily by checking the defining relations of $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ be a cyclotomic Brauer algebra over R. There is an R-linear anti-involution $* : \mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta}) \to \mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ such that $h^* = h$ for all $h \in \{e_i, s_i, t_j \mid 1 \le i < n, 1 \le j \le n\}$.*

Recall that F is a splitting field of $x^m - 1$. In the remaining part of this section, we assume $e \nmid m \cdot n!$. By [8, 8.2], F contains ξ, a primitive m-th root of unity.

We will decompose an $FW_{m,2}$-module in Proposition 2.5, where $W_{m,n}$ is the complex reflection group of type $G(m, 1, n)$. Note that $W_{m,n}$ is generated by s_i, t_1 satisfying the relations

- $s_i^2 = t_1^m = 1$ for $1 \le i \le n-1$.
- $s_i s_j s_i = s_j s_i s_j$, if $|i-j| = 1$.
- $s_i s_j = s_j s_i$, if $|i-j| > 1$.
- $s_i t_1 = t_1 s_i$ if $1 < i \le n-1$.
- $s_1 t_1 s_1 t_1 = t_1 s_1 t_1 s_1$.

The order of $W_{m,n}$ is $m^n \cdot n!$. By Maschke's theorem, the group algebra $FW_{m,n}$ is (split) semisimple.

Let $\Lambda_m^+(n)$ be the set of m-partitions of n. When $m = 1$, we use $\Lambda^+(n)$ instead of $\Lambda_1^+(n)$. For any $\lambda \in \Lambda_m^+(n)$, let S^λ be the classical Specht module with respect to λ (see [5, 2.1]).

For any $\lambda \in \Lambda^+(n)$, let $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \cdots)$ with $\mu_i = \#\{j \mid \lambda_j \geq i\}$. Then μ, which will be denoted by λ', is called the dual partition of λ. If $\lambda = (\lambda^{(1)}, \lambda^{(2)}, \cdots, \lambda^{(m)}) \in \Lambda_m^+(n)$, we write $\lambda' = (\lambda^{(m)'}, \lambda^{(m-1)'}, \cdots, \lambda^{(1)'})$ and call λ' the dual partition of λ.

Remark 2.2. *All modules considered in this paper are left modules. I.e.* $S^\lambda = FW_{m,n} y_{\lambda'} w_{\lambda'} x_\lambda$ *if we keep the notation in* [5]*. In* [13]*, we have assumed* $u_i = \xi^i$*,* $1 \leq i \leq m$*. In this paper, we keep this assumption in order to use results in* [13] *directly.*

Since $FW_{m,n}$ is the Ariki-Koike algebra with $q = 1$ and $x_1^m - 1 = \prod_{i=1}^m (x_1 - u_i)$, the following result is a special case of the result in [5].

Lemma 2.3. *The set* $\{ S^\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda_m^+(n) \}$ *is a complete set of pairwise non-isomorphic irreducible* $FW_{m,n}$*-modules.*

Definition 2.4. Let m be a positive integer. If m is even, we define $\wp_m(2) = \{\eta_i \mid \frac{m}{2} \leq i \leq m\}$, where

$$\eta_i = \begin{cases} (0, \cdots, 0, 2), & \text{if } i = m, \\ (0, \cdots, 0, \underset{\frac{m}{2}-th}{2}, 0 \cdots, 0), & \text{if } i = \frac{m}{2}, \\ (0, \cdots, 0, \underset{(m-i)-th}{1}, 0, \cdots, 0, \underset{i-th}{1}, 0, \cdots, 0), & \text{if } \frac{m}{2} < i \leq m-1. \end{cases}$$

If m is odd, we define $\wp_m(2) = \{\eta_i \mid \frac{m+1}{2} \leq i \leq m\}$, where

$$\eta_i = \begin{cases} (0, \cdots, 0, 2), & \text{if } i = m, \\ (0, \cdots, 0, \underset{(m-i)-th}{1}, 0, \cdots, 0, \underset{i-th}{1}, 0, \cdots, 0), & \text{if } \frac{m+1}{2} \leq i \leq m-1. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 2.5. *Let* $\mathbb{Z}_m \wr B_1$ *be the subgroup of* $W_{m,2}$ *generated by* s_1*,* $t_1 t_2$*. As* $FW_{m,2}$*-modules,* $\mathrm{Ind}_{\mathbb{Z}_m \wr B_1}^{W_{m,2}} 1 \cong \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \wp_m(2)} S^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$*.*

Proof. Since $\{1, t_1, \cdots, t_1^{m-1}\}$ is a complete set of left coset representatives of $\mathbb{Z}_m \wr B_1$ in $W_{m,2}$, $\{t_1^k \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} (t_1 t_2)^l (1 + s_1) \mid 0 \leq k \leq m-1\}$ is an F-basis of $\mathrm{Ind}_{\mathbb{Z}_m \wr B_1}^{W_{m,2}} 1$. By assumption, F contains a primitive m-th root of unity, say ξ. Since we are assuming that $u_i = \xi^i$, $1 \leq i \leq m$, $\mathrm{Ind}_{\mathbb{Z}_m \wr B_1}^{\mathbb{Z}_m \wr \mathfrak{S}_2} 1$ has a basis $\{ w_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq m \}$, where

$$w_i = \prod_{j \neq i, 1 \leq j \leq m} (t_1 - u_j) \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} (t_1 t_2)^l (1 + s_1).$$

Since $\prod_{i=1}^m (t_1 - \xi^i) = 0$,

$$w_i = \prod_{\substack{j \neq i \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} (t_1 - u_j) \prod_{1 \leq j \leq m-1} (u_i t_2 - u_j)(1 + s_1).$$

By rescaling the above elements, $\{\mathbf{v}_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq m\}$ is a basis of $\mathrm{Ind}_{\mathbb{Z}_m \wr B_1}^{\mathbb{Z}_m \wr \mathfrak{S}_2} 1$, where

$$\mathbf{v}_i = \prod_{j \neq i} (t_1 - u_j) \prod_{j \neq m-i} (t_2 - u_j)(1 + s_1).$$

We have:

- $F\mathbf{v}_m$ is an $FW_{m,2}$-module with $s_1 \mathbf{v}_m = t_1 \mathbf{v}_m = \mathbf{v}_m$. By [5, 2.1], $F\mathbf{v}_m \cong S^{\eta_m}$.

- Suppose $2 \nmid m$. If $\frac{m+1}{2} \le i \le m-1$, then $\xi^i \ne \xi^{m-i}$. The subspace $F\mathbf{v}_i \oplus F\mathbf{v}_{m-i}$ is an $FW_{m,2}$-module such that $t_1\mathbf{v}_j = u_j\mathbf{v}_j$ for $j = i, m-i$, and $s_1\mathbf{v}_i = \mathbf{v}_{m-i}$. Therefore, $F\mathbf{v}_i \oplus F\mathbf{v}_{m-i} \cong S^{\eta_i}$, $\frac{m+1}{2} \le i \le m-1$.
- Suppose $2 \mid m$. If $\frac{m}{2} < i \le m-1$, then $F\mathbf{v}_i \oplus F\mathbf{v}_{m-i}$ is an $FW_{m,2}$-module such that $t_1\mathbf{v}_j = u_j\mathbf{v}_j$ for $j = i, m-i$, and $s_1\mathbf{v}_i = \mathbf{v}_{m-i}$. Therefore, $F\mathbf{v}_i \oplus F\mathbf{v}_{m-i} \cong S^{\eta_i}$, $\frac{m}{2} < i \le m-1$.
- Suppose $i = \frac{m}{2}$. Then $F\mathbf{v}_i$ is an $FW_{m,2}$-module such that $s_1\mathbf{v}_i = \mathbf{v}_i$ and $t_1\mathbf{v}_i = u_i\mathbf{v}_i$. Therefore, $F\mathbf{v}_i \cong S^{\eta_i}$.

Consequently, $\mathrm{Ind}_{\mathbb{Z}_m \wr B_1}^{\mathbb{Z}_m \wr \mathfrak{S}_2} 1 \cong \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \wp_m(2)} S^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ no matter whether m is even or odd. □

Remark 2.6. *Proposition 2.5 is a special case of* [13, (4.4)]. *The decomposition given there involves certain m-partitions η. In fact, we have to put more restrictions on η. The reason is that $\sum_{l=0}^{m-1} \tilde{t}_i^l w e_{\boldsymbol{a}}$ may be equal to zero for general $\boldsymbol{a}$ (Here, we keep the notation in* [13]*). Therefore, the first equality in* [13, (4.3)] *is not true in general. If we denote by c_η the multiplicity of S^η in $Ind_{\mathbb{Z}_m \wr B_k}^{\mathbb{Z}_m \wr \mathfrak{S}_{2k}} 1$,* [13, (4.1), 6.2] *are still true although we do not know the explicit description of c_η. Proposition 2.5 gives us the explicit information for η and c_η when $k = 1$.*

In the remaining part of this section, we recall the result in [13], which says that $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ is a cellular algebra in the sense of [6]. We also prove Theorem 2.9, which will play the key role in the proof of Theorem A.

Recall that a dotted Brauer diagram D with k horizontal arcs is determined by a pair of labelled (n,k)-parenthesis diagrams α, β and $w \in W_{m,n-2k}$, and vice versa [13]. In this situation, we write $D = \alpha \otimes w \otimes \beta$ if

- α (resp. β) is the top (resp. bottom) row of D.
- w corresponds to the dotted Brauer diagram (or braid diagram) which is obtained from D by removing the horizontal arcs at top and bottom rows of D.

We denote by $P(n,k)$ the set of all labelled (n,k)-parenthesis diagrams.

Suppose $\lambda \in \Lambda_m^+(n)$. A λ-tableau is a bijection $\mathfrak{t} = (\mathfrak{t}_1, \cdots, \mathfrak{t}_{m-1}, \mathfrak{t}_m) : (Y(\lambda^{(1)}), \cdots Y(\lambda^{(m-1)}), Y(\lambda^{(m)})) \to \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$. If the entries in each $\mathfrak{t}_i$, $1 \le i \le m$ increase from left to right in each row and from top to bottom in each column, then $\mathfrak{t}$ is called a standard λ-tableau. Let $T^s(\lambda)$ be the set of all standard λ-tableaux. Let $\{y_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}}^\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda_m^+(n), \mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in T^s(\lambda)\}$ be the Murphy basis for $FW_{m,n}$ [5, 2.8]. Define

$$C_{(\alpha,\mathfrak{s}),(\beta,\mathfrak{t})}^{(k,\lambda)} = \alpha \otimes y_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}}^\lambda \otimes \beta, \quad \alpha, \beta \in P(n,k), \mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in T^{\mathfrak{s}}(\lambda) \tag{2.7}$$

Recall that R is a commutative ring containing the identity 1 and $\delta_1, \cdots, \delta_m$.

Theorem 2.8. [13, 5.11] *Suppose R contains $u_1, \cdots, u_m$ such that $x^m - 1 = (x-u_1)(x-u_2)\cdots(x-u_m)$. Let $\Lambda = \{(f,\lambda) \mid 0 \le f \le \lfloor n/2 \rfloor, \lambda \in \Lambda_m^+(n-2f)\}$. Then*

$$\{C_{(\alpha,\mathfrak{s}),(\beta,\mathfrak{t})}^{(k,\lambda)} \mid \alpha, \beta \in P(n,k), \mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in T^s(\lambda), (k,\lambda) \in \Lambda\}$$

is a cellular basis of $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$. The R-linear anti-involution defined on $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ is that defined in Lemma 2.1.

Following [6, 2.1], we have the cell modules for $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ with respect to the cellular basis provided in Theorem 2.8. Let $\Delta(k,\lambda)$ be the cell module for $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ with respect to $(k,\lambda)\in\Lambda$. Let $\Delta(\lambda)$ be the cell module for $FW_{m,n}$ with respect to the cellular basis $\{y^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{st}}\mid \lambda\in\Lambda^+_m(n),\mathfrak{s},\mathfrak{t}\in T^s(\lambda)\}$.

It has been proved in [5, 2.7] that $\Delta(\lambda)\cong S^{\lambda'}$, where λ' is the dual partition of λ. By [6, 2.1], $\Delta(k,\lambda)$ is spanned by $\alpha\otimes\mathbf{v}_j\otimes\alpha_0 \mod \mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})^{>(k,\lambda)}$, where $\mathbf{v}_j$ ranges over the basis elements of $S^{\lambda'}$.

Suppose $\lambda\in\Lambda^+_m(n)$ and $\mu\in\Lambda^+_m(n-1)$. If there is a pair (i,j) such that $\lambda^{(j)}_i=\mu^{(j)}_i+1$ and $\lambda^{(k)}_l=\mu^{(k)}_l$ for any $(k,l)\neq(i,j)$, then we write $\mu\to\lambda$ and say that μ is obtained from λ by removing a box. In this situation, we also say that λ can be obtained from μ by adding a box.

Theorem 2.9. *Let $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ be a cyclotomic Brauer algebra over F. If $\mu\in\Lambda^+_m(n-2)$ and $\lambda\in\Lambda^+_m(n)$, then either $[\Delta(1,\mu'):\Delta(\lambda')]=0$ or $[\Delta(1,\mu'):\Delta(\lambda')]=1$. Furthermore, $[\Delta(1,\mu'):\Delta(\lambda')]=1$ if one of the following conditions holds true.*

1. *$\lambda^{(j)}=\mu^{(j)}$, $j\neq m$ and two boxes in the skew Young diagram $Y(\lambda^{(m)}/\mu^{(m)})$ are not in the same column.*
2. *Suppose that m is odd. There is an i with $\frac{m+1}{2}\le i\le m-1$ such that $\mu^{(i)}\to\lambda^{(i)}$ and $\mu^{(m-i)}\to\lambda^{(m-i)}$, and $\lambda^{(j)}=\mu^{(j)}$ for $j\neq i,m-i$.*
3. *Suppose that m is even. There is an i with $\frac{m}{2}<i\le m-1$ such that $\mu^{(i)}\to\lambda^{(i)}$ and $\mu^{(m-i)}\to\lambda^{(m-i)}$, and $\lambda^{(j)}=\mu^{(j)}$ for $j\neq i,m-i$.*
4. *Suppose that m is even. $\lambda^{(j)}=\mu^{(j)}$, $j\neq m/2$ and two boxes in the skew Young diagram $Y(\lambda^{(\frac{m}{2})}/\mu^{(\frac{m}{2})})$ are not in the same column.*

Proof. Since we are assuming that F is a splitting field of x^m-1 such that $e\nmid m\cdot n!$, both $FW_{m,k}$ and $F\mathfrak{S}_k$ are (split) semisimple for $k\le n$.

For $\lambda\in\Lambda^+(n_1+n_2),\mu\in\Lambda^+(n_1),\eta\in\Lambda^+(n_2)$, let $L^{\lambda}_{\eta,\mu}$ be the corresponding Littlewood-Richardson coefficient for symmetric groups. If $\lambda\in\Lambda^+_m(n)$, $\mu\in\Lambda^+_m(n-2)$ and $\eta\in\Lambda^+_m(2)$, the Littlewood-Richardson coefficient $L^{\lambda}_{\eta,\mu}$ for complex reflection groups is $\prod_{i=1}^m L^{\lambda^{(i)}}_{\eta^{(i)},\mu^{(i)}}$ [13, §4]. Let c_η be the multiplicity of S^η in $\mathrm{Ind}^{W_{m,2}}_{\mathbb{Z}_m\wr B_1}1$. By [13, 6.2], $[\Delta(1,\mu'):\Delta(\lambda')]=m_{\mu,\lambda}$, where $m_{\mu,\lambda}=\sum_{\eta\in\wp_m(2)}c_\eta L^{\lambda}_{\eta,\mu}$. Note that $L^{\lambda}_{\eta,\mu}\neq0$ if and only if $L^{\lambda^{(i)}}_{\eta^{(i)},\mu^{(i)}}\neq0$ for $1\le i\le m$. Consequently, if $L^{\lambda}_{\eta,\mu}\neq0$ for $\eta\in\wp_m(2)$, then there is a unique $\eta\in\wp_m(2)$. Suppose λ and μ are partitions. It is known that two boxes in the skew Young diagram $Y(\lambda/\mu)$ are not in the same column if $L^{\lambda}_{(2),\mu}\neq0$ (see, e.g. [4, §3]). In this situation, $L^{\lambda}_{(2),\mu}=1$, and $\lambda\supset\mu$. We use classical branching rule for symmetric groups if either $\eta\notin\{\eta_m,\eta_{\frac{m}{2}}\}$, $2\mid m$ or $\eta\neq\eta_m$, $2\nmid m$. In any case, we have $m_{\mu,\lambda}=1$, if one of conditions in (1)-(4) holds true. □

Definition 2.10. Suppose $\mu\in\Lambda^+_m(n-2)$ and $\lambda\in\Lambda^+_m(n)$. λ is called μ-admissible if one of the conditions in Theorem 2.9(1)-(4) holds true. Let $\mathscr{A}(\mu)$ be the set of all μ-admissible m-partitions.

3. ZERO DIVISORS OF CERTAIN DISCRIMINANTS

In this section, we assume $\delta_i \in F$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$, where F is a splitting field of $x^m - 1$ and $e \nmid m \cdot n!$. The main purpose of this section is to prove Theorem 3.9, which will give all zero divisors of the discriminants of the Gram matrices $\mathcal{G}_{1,\mu'}$ with respect to the cell modules $\Delta(1, \mu')$, $\mu \in \Lambda_m^+(n-2)$.

Recall that $P(n, k)$ is the set of labelled parenthesis Brauer diagrams with k horizontal arcs. In what follows, we assume $\alpha_0 = top(e_{n-1}) \in P(n, 1)$, the top row of e_{n-1}. Define M_1 and M_2 by setting

- $M_1 = \{ \alpha \otimes w \otimes \alpha_0 \mid \alpha \in P(n, 1), w \in W_{m,n-2} \}$.
- $M_2 = \{ \alpha \otimes w \otimes \beta \mid \alpha, \beta \in P(n, k), w \in W_{m,n-2k}, 2 \leq k \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor \}$.

We consider the quotient F-subspace $V = V_1/V_2$, where V_1 (resp. V_2) is spanned by $M_1 \cup M_2$ (resp. M_2). For convenience, we use $\alpha \otimes w \otimes \alpha_0$ instead of $\alpha \otimes w \otimes \alpha_0 + V_2$.

Recall that any dotted Brauer diagram can be written as $\alpha \otimes w \otimes \beta$ where $\alpha, \beta \in P(n, k)$ and $w \in W_{m,n-2k}$. Let $\tilde{\alpha} \in P(n, k)$ be such that

a) α and $\tilde{\alpha}$ have the same horizontal arcs.

b) There are $m - i$ dots on a horizontal arc in $\tilde{\alpha}$ if and only if there are i dots on the corresponding horizontal arc in α.

Define an R-linear isomorphism $\iota : \mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta}) \longrightarrow \mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ by declaring that

$$\iota(\alpha \otimes w \otimes \beta) = \tilde{\beta} \otimes w^{-1} \otimes \tilde{\alpha}. \tag{3.1}$$

We remark that ι is not an algebraic (anti-)homomorphism since $\iota(e_i t_i^k e_i) = \delta_k e_i \neq \delta_{m-k} e_i$ in general. However, by straightforward computation, we have

$$\iota(w(\alpha \otimes w_1 \otimes \beta)) = \iota(\alpha \otimes w_1 \otimes \beta) w^{-1}, \tag{3.2}$$

for any $\alpha, \beta \in P(n, k), w \in W_{m,n}, w_1 \in W_{m,n-2k}$.

Following [7], we have the following definition.

Definition 3.3. Suppose $\alpha_i \otimes w \otimes \alpha_0 \in V$ for $i = 1, 2$. Let $\langle \alpha_1 \otimes w_1 \otimes \alpha_0, \alpha_2 \otimes w_2 \otimes \alpha_0 \rangle$ be the coefficient of e_{n-1} in the expression of $\iota(\alpha_1 \otimes w_1 \otimes \alpha_0) \cdot (\alpha_2 \otimes w_2 \otimes \alpha_0)$, where ι is defined in (3.1). Let $\mathcal{G}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ be the $f \times f$-matrix with $f = \dim V$ such that the entry in $(\alpha_1 \otimes w_1 \otimes \alpha_0)$-th row, $(\alpha_2 \otimes w_2 \otimes \alpha_0)$-th column is $\langle \alpha_1 \otimes w_1 \otimes \alpha_0, \alpha_2 \otimes w_2 \otimes \alpha_0 \rangle$.

If either $h_1 \in M_2$ or $h_2 \in M_2$, then $\iota(h_1) h_2 \in V_2$. Since $e_{n-1} \notin V_2$, $\langle h_1, h_2 \rangle = 0$. Hence, $\langle \ , \ \rangle : V \times V \longrightarrow F$ is a well-defined F-bilinear form on V.

The following lemma can be verified easily.

Lemma 3.4. *$\mathcal{G}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta}) = (g_{ij})$ is an $f \times f$ matrix such that $g_{ii} = \delta_0$, $1 \leq i \leq f$ and $g_{ij} \in \{ 0, 1, \delta_1, \cdots, \delta_{m-1} \}$ if $i \neq j$.*

Lemma 3.5. *$\mathcal{G}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta}) : V \to V$ is a left $FW_{m,n}$-homomorphism and a right $FW_{m,n-2}$ homomorphism*

Proof. We consider $\mathcal{G}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ as the F-linear endomorphism on V such that

$$\mathcal{G}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})(\alpha_1 \otimes w_1 \otimes \alpha_0) = \sum_{\alpha \in P(n,1), w \in W_{m,n-2}} \langle \alpha \otimes w \otimes \alpha_0, \alpha_1 \otimes w_1 \otimes \alpha_0 \rangle \alpha \otimes w \otimes \alpha_0.$$

By (3.2),

$$\langle w(\alpha_1 \otimes w_1 \otimes \alpha_0), w(\alpha_2 \otimes w_2 \otimes \alpha_0)\rangle = \langle \alpha_1 \otimes w_1 \otimes \alpha_0, \alpha_2 \otimes w_2 \otimes \alpha_0\rangle.$$

In other words, $\mathcal{G}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta}) : V \to V$ is a left $FW_{m,n}$-homomorphism.

On the other hand, since $(\alpha_1 \otimes w_1 \otimes \alpha_0)y = \alpha_1 \otimes w_1 y \otimes \alpha_0$ for any $y \in W_{m,n-2}$, e_{n-1} appears in $y^{-1}(\alpha_0 \otimes w_1 \otimes \alpha_0)y$ with non-zero coefficient if and only if $w_1 = 1$. Therefore,

$$\langle (\alpha_1 \otimes w_1 \otimes \alpha_0)y, (\alpha_2 \otimes w_2 \otimes \alpha_0)y\rangle = \langle \alpha_1 \otimes w_1 \otimes \alpha_0, \alpha_2 \otimes w_2 \otimes \alpha_0\rangle.$$

Consequently, $\mathcal{G}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta}) : V \to V$ is a right $FW_{m,n-2}$-homomorphism. □

Since we are assuming that F is a splitting field of $x^m - 1$ and $e \nmid m \cdot n!$, $FW_{m,k}$ is (split) semisimple for any k, $1 \le k \le n$. Assume that $\lambda \in \Lambda_m^+(k)$. The classical Specht module S^λ is a direct summand of $FW_{m,k}$. Consequently, $\Delta(1, \lambda')$ can be realized as a submodule of V, which is spanned by $\alpha \otimes v_j \otimes \alpha_0 (\mod V_2)$, where v_j ranges over the basis elements of S^λ. Note that $\mathcal{G}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ is a right $FW_{m,n-2}$-module. For any $\lambda \in \Lambda_m^+(n-2)$, the restriction of $\mathcal{G}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ on $\Delta(1, \lambda')$ induces a linear endomorphism on $\Delta(1, \lambda')$.

Definition 3.6. For $\mu \in \Lambda_m^+(n-2)$, define $g_\mu = \prod_{\lambda \in \mathscr{A}(\mu)} g_{\lambda,\mu}$, where

$$g_{\lambda,\mu} = (\overline{\delta}_0 - m + m \sum_{p \in Y(\lambda/\mu)} c(p)) \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} (\overline{\delta}_i + m \sum_{p \in Y(\lambda/\mu)} c(p)). \tag{3.7}$$

It follows from [6, 2.3] that there is an invariant symmetric bilinear form defined on each cell module $\Delta(k, \lambda)$. Via such a bilinear form, one can define a Gram matrix $\mathcal{G}_{k,\lambda}$. Let $\det \mathcal{G}_{k,\lambda}$ be the determinant of $\mathcal{G}_{k,\lambda}$. The following result follows from [6, 3.8] and Theorem 2.8, immediately.

Lemma 3.8. *$\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ is (split) semisimple over F if and only if $\det \mathcal{G}_{k,\lambda} \neq 0$ for all $(k, \lambda) \in \Lambda$.*

In general, it is difficult to compute $\det \mathcal{G}_{k,\lambda}$. Assume $\delta_i \neq 0$ for some $1 \le i \le m$. The following result describes all the zero divisors of $\det \mathcal{G}_{1,\lambda}$, $\lambda \in \Lambda_m^+(n-2)$. Fortunately, it completely determines $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ being (split) semisimple.

Theorem 3.9. *Suppose $\delta_i \neq 0$ for some $i, 1 \le i \le m$. $\det \mathcal{G}_{1,\mu'} = 0$ if and only if $g_\mu = 0$.*

Proof. ($\Rightarrow$) If $\det \mathcal{G}_{1,\mu'} = 0$, then we can find an irreducible $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$-module $M \subset \operatorname{Rad} \mathcal{G}_{1,\mu'}$, where $\operatorname{Rad} \mathcal{G}_{1,\mu'} = \{ v \in \Delta(1, \mu') \mid \mathcal{G}_{1,\mu'}(v) = 0 \}$. It follows from [6, 2.6, 3.4] that any irreducible module of a cellular algebra must be the simple head of a cell module, say $\Delta(k, \lambda')$. Hence, there is a non-zero homomorphism from $\Delta(k, \lambda')$ to $\Delta(1, \mu')$ with $(k, \lambda') < (1, \mu')$. Therefore, either $k = 1$ or $k = 0$.

Assume that $k = 1$. We use [13, 7.4][1] to get a non-zero homomorphism from $\Delta(0, \lambda')$ to $\Delta(0, \mu')$. Notice that, as $FW_{m,n}$-modules, $\Delta(0, \lambda') \cong S^{\lambda}$. Since $FW_{m,n}$ is (split) semisimple, we have $\lambda = \mu$, a contradiction since $(1, \lambda') < (1, \mu')$.

If $k = 0$, then there is a non-zero $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$-homomorphism from $\Delta(0, \lambda')$ to $\Delta(1, \mu')$, forcing $\lambda \in \mathscr{A}(\mu)$. By [13, 8.6, 8.8], $g_{\lambda,\mu} = 0$. We have $g_\mu = 0$ as required.

($\Leftarrow$) Suppose $g_\mu = 0$. Then there is a $\lambda \in \mathscr{A}(\mu)$ such that $g_{\lambda,\mu} = 0$. Since $\lambda \in \mathscr{A}(\mu)$, by Theorem 2.9, $[\Delta(1, \mu') : S^{\lambda}] = 1$. Hence, there is a unique $FW_{m,n}$-submodule M of $\Delta(1, \mu')$ which is isomorphic to S^{λ}. Recall that $\mathscr{G}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta}) \mid_{\Delta(1,\mu')}$ is a linear endomorphism on $\Delta(1, \mu')$. For simplicity, we use $\mathscr{G}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ instead of $\mathscr{G}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta}) \mid_{\Delta(1,\mu')}$ if there is no confusion.

Since $\mathscr{G}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ is an $FW_{m,n}$-homomorphism, and $[\Delta(1, \mu') : S^{\lambda}] = 1$, $\mathscr{G}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})(M) \subset M$. By Schur's Lemma, $\mathscr{G}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta}) \mid_M = f(\boldsymbol{\delta}) I$, where I is $\dim M \times \dim M$ identity matrix and $f(\boldsymbol{\delta}) := f(\delta_0, \delta_1, \cdots, \delta_{m-1})$ is a polynomial in $\delta_i, 0 \le i \le m-1$.

Take a basis of M and extend it to get a basis of V via the elements $\alpha \otimes w \otimes \alpha_0$. Then $\mathscr{G}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ is conjugate to $\begin{pmatrix} f(\boldsymbol{\delta})I & 0 \\ * & B \end{pmatrix}$, where any entry in the diagonal of B is δ_0, and the term of the entry of B elsewhere does not contains δ_0. Since the degree of δ_0 in $\det \mathscr{G}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ is $\dim V$ (see Lemma 3.2), the degree of δ_0 in $f(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ must be 1. In particular, $f(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ is not a constant number. Take the parameters $\delta_0, \delta_1, \cdots, \delta_{m-1}$ such that $f(\boldsymbol{\delta}) = 0$. Then $\mathscr{G}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta}) \mid_M = 0$.

We claim $e_{n-1} v = 0$ for any $v \in M$. Write $v = \sum_{\alpha^s, w} a_{\alpha^s, w} \alpha^s \otimes w \otimes \alpha_0$, where there are s dots at the left endpoint of the unique arc in α^s. We divide $P(n, 1)$ into three disjoint subsets P_1, P_2, P_3 as follows. Recall that a point in α^s is called a fixed point if it is an endpoint of a horizontal arc of α^s. Otherwise, it is called a free point.

- P_1 consists of all $\alpha^s \in P(n, 1)$ such that $(n-1, n)$ is a unique arc of α^s. Then $e_{n-1}(\alpha^s \otimes w \otimes \alpha_0) = \delta_s \alpha_0 \otimes w \otimes \alpha_0$.
- P_2 consists of all $\alpha^s \in P(n, 1)$ such that both $n-1$ and n are free points in α. Then $e_{n-1} \alpha^s \otimes w \otimes \alpha_0 = 0$.
- P_3 consists of all $\alpha^s \in P(n, 1)$ such that either $n-1$ or n is a fixed point. Let i be the left endpoint of the unique arc in α^s. By assumption, there are s dots at the endpoint i. We define $w_{\alpha^s} \in \mathfrak{S}_{n-2}$ by setting

$$w_{\alpha^s} = \begin{pmatrix} i & i+1 & i+2 & \cdots & n-3 & n-2 \\ n-2 & i & i+1 & \cdots & n-4 & n-3 \end{pmatrix}$$

Define $y_{\alpha^s} := t_i^s w_{\alpha^s}$. Then $e_{n-1} \cdot (\alpha^s \otimes 1 \otimes \alpha_0) = \alpha_0 \otimes y_{\alpha^s} \otimes \alpha_0$. Therefore, the coefficient of $\alpha_0 \otimes w_1 \otimes \alpha_0$ in $e_{n-1} v$ is $\sum_{\alpha^s \in P_3} a_{\alpha^s, y_{\alpha_s}^{-1} w_1} + \sum_{s=0}^{m-1} \delta_{\mathfrak{s}} a_{\alpha_0^s, w_1}$.

---

[1] [13, 7.4] is for $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ over the complex field. However, it is still true if we use F, a splitting field of $x^m - 1$ with $e \nmid m \cdot n!$, instead of $\mathbb{C}$. See [13, 8.8].

On the other hand, by direct computation, the coefficient of $\alpha_0 \otimes w_1 \otimes \alpha_0$ in $\mathcal{G}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})v$ is $\sum_{\substack{\alpha^s \in P(n,1),\\ w \in W_{m,n-2}}} a_{\alpha^s, w} \langle \alpha_0 \otimes w_1 \otimes \alpha_0, \alpha^s \otimes w \otimes \alpha_0 \rangle$. We have

$$\langle \alpha_0 \otimes w_1 \otimes \alpha_0, \alpha^s \otimes w \otimes \alpha_0 \rangle = \begin{cases} \delta_s, & \text{if } \alpha^s \in P_1, w = w_1, \\ 0, & \text{if } \alpha^s \in P_1, w \neq w_1, \\ 0, & \text{if } \alpha^s \in P_2, \\ 1, & \text{if } \alpha^s \in P_3 \text{ and } w = y_{\alpha^s}^{-1} w_1. \\ 0, & \text{if } \alpha^s \in P_3 \text{ and } w \neq y_{\alpha^s}^{-1} w_1. \end{cases}$$

Since $\mathcal{G}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})v = 0$, the coefficient of $\alpha_0 \otimes w_1 \otimes \alpha_0$ in $\mathcal{G}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})v$ is zero. Therefore,

$$\sum_{\substack{\alpha^s \in P(n,1),\\ w \in W_{m,n-2}}} a_{\alpha^s, w} \langle \alpha_0 \otimes w_1 \otimes \alpha_0, \alpha^s \otimes w \otimes \alpha_0 \rangle = \sum_{\alpha^s \in P_3} a_{\alpha^s, y_{\alpha^s}^{-1} w_1} + \sum_{s=0}^{m-1} \delta_{\mathfrak{s}} a_{\alpha_0^s, w_1} = 0,$$

forcing the coefficient of $\alpha_0 \otimes w_1 \otimes \alpha_0$ in $e_{n-1}v$ to be zero for all $w_1 \in W_{m,n-2}$. This completes the proof of the claim.

Therefore, as $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$-module, $M \cong \Delta(0, \lambda')$. We obtain a non-zero $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$-homomorphism from $\Delta(0, \lambda')$ to $\Delta(1, \mu')$. In particular, $\det G_{1,\mu'} = 0$. By [13, 8.6, 8.8][2] the parameters δ_i's must satisfy the equation $g_{\lambda,\mu} = 0$, the condition we have assumed. □

4. Proof of Theorem A

In this section, we prove Theorem A, the main result of this paper. Unless otherwise stated, we assume that F is a splitting field of $x^m - 1$, which contains $\delta_i, 1 \le i \le m$. Assume $m > 1$.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose $n \ge 2$. If $0 \neq \delta_i \in F$ for some i, $1 \le i \le m$, then $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ is (split) semisimple if and only if $e \nmid m \cdot n!$ and $\det \mathcal{G}_{1,\lambda} \neq 0$ for any $\lambda \in \Lambda_m^+(k-2)$, $2 \le k \le n$.*

Proof. ($\Leftarrow$) Suppose that $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ is not (split) semisimple. There is a $(k, \lambda) \in \Lambda$ such that $\det \mathcal{G}_{k,\mu} = 0$. Since $FW_{m,n}$ is (split) semisimple, $k \neq 0$.

Take an irreducible submodule $M \subset \operatorname{Rad} \Delta(k, \mu)$. By [6, 2.6, 3.4], M must be isomorphic to the simple head of a cell module, say $\Delta(l, \lambda)$, such that $(l, \lambda) < (k, \mu)$. Furthermore, it results in a non-trivial homomorphism from $\Delta(l, \lambda)$ to $\Delta(k, \mu)$.

If $l = k$, we use [13, 7.4] to get $\Delta(0, \lambda) \cong \Delta(0, \mu)$. As $FW_{m,n-2k}$-modules, $\Delta(0, \lambda) \cong S^{\lambda'}$. Since $FW_{m,n-2k}$ is (split) semisimple, $\lambda = \mu$, which contradicts $(l, \lambda) < (k, \mu)$.

Suppose $l < k$. By [13, 7.4, 7.7], there is a non-trivial homomorphism from $\Delta(0, \tilde{\lambda})$ to $\Delta(1, \tilde{\mu})$ for some $\tilde{\mu} \in \Lambda_m^+(p-2)$ with $p \le n$. By assumption, $\det \mathcal{G}_{1,\tilde{\mu}} \neq 0$. Hence, $\Delta(1, \tilde{\mu}) = D^{(1,\tilde{\mu})} \cong \Delta(0, \tilde{\lambda})$. By [6, 3.4], $(0, \tilde{\lambda}) = (1, \tilde{\mu})$, a contradiction.

($\Rightarrow$) If $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ is (split) semisimple, then [6, 3.8] implies that $\det \mathcal{G}_{k,\lambda} \neq 0$ for all $0 \le k \le \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. Therefore, $FW_{m,n}$ is (split) semisimple, forcing $e \nmid m \cdot n!$.

---

[2] under our assumption, the group algebra $FW_{m,n}$ is (split) semisimple. Since the proof of [13, 8.6, 8.8] depends only on the fact that $\mathbb{C}W_{m,n}$ is (split) semisimple, we can apply these results here.

Suppose $\det \mathcal{G}_{1,\mu'} = 0$ for some $\mu' \in \Lambda_m^+(k-2)$. Then $k < n$. By Theorem 3.9, there is a μ-admissible m-partition λ such that $g_{\lambda,\mu} = 0$. Equivalently, there is a non-zero $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$-homomorphism from $\Delta(0,\lambda')$ to $\Delta(1,\mu')$.

Since we are assuming that $m \geq 2$, we can find an $i, 1 \leq i \leq m$, such that $\lambda^{(i)} = \mu^{(i)}$. We can add l boxes to $\lambda^{(i)}$ so as to get another partition $\tilde{\lambda}^{(i)} = \tilde{\mu}^{(i)}$. In this situation, $g_{\tilde{\lambda},\tilde{\mu}} = g_{\lambda,\mu}$, where $\tilde{\lambda}$ (resp. $\tilde{\mu}$) can be obtained from λ (resp. μ) by using $\tilde{\lambda}^{(i)}$ instead of $\lambda^{(i)}$ (resp. $\mu^{(i)}$). By definition, $\tilde{\lambda} \in \mathscr{A}(\tilde{\mu})$. If we take l such that $|\lambda| + l = n$, then $\Delta(0,\tilde{\lambda}')$ and $\Delta(1,\tilde{\mu}')$ are $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$-modules. By Theorem 3.9, $\det \mathcal{G}_{1,\tilde{\mu}'} = 0$. However, since $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ is (split) semisimple, $\det \mathcal{G}_{1,\tilde{\mu}'} \neq 0$, a contradiction. □

Corollary 4.2. *Let $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ be a cyclotomic Brauer algebra over F, where F contains a non-zero δ_i for some $i, 1 \leq i \leq m$. $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ is (split) semisimple if only if $\det \mathcal{G}_{k,\lambda} \neq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda_m^+(n-2k)$, and $k = 0, 1$.*

Proof. Suppose $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ is (split) semisimple. It follows from [6, 3.8] that $\det \mathcal{G}_{k,\lambda} \neq 0$ for all $0 \leq k \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. In particular, $\det \mathcal{G}_{k,\lambda} \neq 0$ with $k = 0, 1$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda_m^+(n-2k)$.

Conversely, if $\det \mathcal{G}_{0,\lambda} \neq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda_m^+(n)$, then $FW_{m,n}$ is (split) semisimple. Suppose that $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ is not (split) semisimple. By Proposition 4.1, there is a $\mu \in \Lambda_m^+(k-2)$ with $k < n$ such that $\det \mathcal{G}_{1,\mu} = 0$. From the proof of Proposition 4.1, we can find a $\tilde{\mu} \in \Lambda_m^+(n-2)$ such that $\det \mathcal{G}_{1,\tilde{\mu}} = 0$. This contradicts our assumption. □

Corollary 4.2 has been stated as a question in [13, p220] . We remark that corollary 4.2 is not true if $m = 1$. In fact, the first author has proved that a Brauer algebra is (split) semisimple over F if and only if $e \nmid n!$ and $\det G_{1,\lambda} \neq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda^+(k-2)$, $2 \leq k \leq n$. By [4, 3.3-3.4], Corollary 4.2 is not true if $m = 1$.

Definition 4.3. Suppose that $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq 2$. For $m \geq 2$, define $\rho_{m,n} = \{ma \mid a \in \tilde{\rho}_{m,n}\}$, where

$$\tilde{\rho}_{m,n} = \{k \in \mathbb{Z} \mid k = \sum_{p \in Y(\lambda/\mu)} c(p) \mid \mu \in \Lambda_m^+(n-2), \lambda \in \mathscr{A}(\mu)\}.$$

If $m = 1$, we define

$$\tilde{\rho}_{m,n} = \{r \in \mathbb{Z} \mid r = \sum_{p \in Y(\lambda/\mu)} c(p) \mid \mu \in \Lambda^+(k-2), \lambda \in \Lambda^+(k), 2 \leq k \leq n\},$$

where two boxes in $Y(\lambda/\mu)$ are not in the same column.

At the end of this paper, we will prove $\tilde{\rho}_{m,n} = \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{m,n}$. Hence, $\rho_{m,n} = \mathbb{Z}_{m,n}$.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ be a cyclotomic Brauer algebra over F, where F contains a non-zero δ_i for some $i, 1 \leq i \leq m$. Suppose $n \geq 2$. $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ is (split) semisimple if and only if*

(1) $e \nmid m \cdot n!$,

(2) $\varepsilon_{i,0} m - \overline{\delta}_i \notin \rho_{m,n}$, $0 \leq i \leq m-1$, *where $\varepsilon_{i,0}$ is the Kronecker function.*

Proof. The result follows from Theorem 3.9 and Corollary 4.2. ☐

In the remaining part of this section, we deal with the case $\delta_i = 0$ for all $1 \le i \le m$. First, we discuss $\mathscr{B}_{m,3}(\mathbf{0})$.

We want to compute $\det G_{1,\lambda}$ with $\lambda = ((1), 0, \cdots, 0)$. Note that we have assumed $u_i = \xi^i$, $1 \le i \le m$. In this situation, $y_{\lambda'} w_{\lambda'} x_\lambda = g(t_1) = \prod_{i=1}^{m-1}(t_1 - \xi^i)$. Write $v_1^{(0)} = top(e_1)$, $v_2^{(0)} = top(s_1 e_2)$ and $v_3^{(0)} = top(e_2)$. Let $v_i^{(k)}$ be obtained from $v_i^{(0)}$ by putting k dots at the left endpoint of the unique horizontal arc in $v_i^{(0)}$. Then $\Delta(1, \lambda)$ can be considered as a free F-module with basis $\{v_i^{(k)} \otimes g(t_1) \otimes v_3^{(0)} \mid 1 \le i \le 3, 0 \le k \le m-1\}$. Let $a = \prod_{i=1}^{m-1}(1 - \xi^i)$. The Gram matrix with respect to this basis is

$$\mathcal{G}_{1,\lambda} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & A & A \\ A & 0 & A \\ A & A & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $A = (a_{ij})$ is the $m \times m$ matrix with $a_{ij} = a$, $1 \le i, j \le m$. Since we are assuming that $m > 1$, $\det \mathcal{G}_{1,\lambda} = 0$. In other words, $\operatorname{Rad} \Delta(1, \lambda) \ne 0$. Take an irreducible submodule D of $\operatorname{Rad} \Delta(1, \lambda)$. Note that any irreducible module must be the simple head of a cell module, say $\Delta(k, \mu)$. Therefore, there is a non-trivial homomorphism from $\Delta(k, \mu)$ to $\Delta(1, \lambda)$. By [6, 2.6], $(k, \mu) < (1, \lambda)$. This proves the following lemma.

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose* $\lambda = ((1), 0, \cdots, 0)$. *There is a cell module* $\Delta(k, \mu)$ *of* $\mathscr{B}_{m,3}(\mathbf{0})$ *with* $(k, \mu) < (1, \lambda)$ *such that there is a non-trivial homomorphism from* $\Delta(k, \mu)$ *to* $\Delta(1, \lambda)$.

Let $J_{m,n}(\mathbf{0})$ be the left ideal of $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\mathbf{0})$ spanned by the dotted Brauer diagrams D such that $\{n-1, n\}$ is a horizontal arc at the bottom row of D. It is clear that $J_{m,n}(\mathbf{0}) = \mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\mathbf{0}) e_{n-1}$.

Following [13], let $I_{m,n}^{\ge k}$ (resp. $I_{m,n}^{> k}$) be the vector space generated by (n, l)-dotted Brauer diagrams with $l \ge k$ (resp. $l > k$). Let $I_{m,n}^{k}(\mathbf{0}) = I_{m,n}^{\ge k} / I_{m,n}^{> k}$. Then $I_{m,n}^{k}(\mathbf{0})$ is a $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\mathbf{0})$-module. Let $I_{m,n}^{k'}(\mathbf{0})$ be the subspace of $I_{m,n}^{k}(\mathbf{0})$ generated by $\{\alpha \otimes w \otimes \beta_0 \mid \alpha \in P(n, k), w \in W_{m,n-2k}\}$, where $\beta_0 = top(e_{n-2k+1} \cdots e_{n-3} e_{n-1})$. Let $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\mathbf{0})$-mod be the category of the left $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\mathbf{0})$-modules. Let

$$G : \mathscr{B}_{m,n-2}(\mathbf{0})\text{-mod} \longrightarrow \mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\mathbf{0})\text{-mod}$$

be the tensor functor defined by declaring that $G(M) = J_{m,n}(\mathbf{0}) \otimes_{\mathscr{B}_{m,n-2}(\mathbf{0})} M$, for any $\mathscr{B}_{m,n-2}(\mathbf{0})$-mod M.

Proposition 4.6. *Suppose* $\lambda \in \Lambda_m^+(n - 2k)$.

(a) *The functor* G *sends non-zero* $\mathscr{B}_{m,n-2}(\mathbf{0})$*-homomorphisms to non-zero ones.*

(b) $G(\Delta(k-1, \lambda)) = \Delta(k, \lambda)$.

Proof. Suppose $\phi : M_1 \to M_2$ is a $\mathscr{B}_{m,n-2}(\mathbf{0})$-module homomorphism. Write $\phi_* = G(\phi)$. For any $D_1 \in \mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\mathbf{0})$, $D \in J_{m,n}(\mathbf{0})$ and $m \in M_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_*(D_1(D \otimes m)) &= \phi_*(D_1 D \otimes m) = (D_1 D) \otimes \phi(m) \\ &= D_1(D \otimes \phi(m)) = D_1 \phi_*(D \otimes m) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, ϕ_* is a $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\mathbf{0})$-homomorphism. For any $\mathscr{B}_{m,n-2}(\mathbf{0})$-module M, define an F-linear map $\alpha : J_{m,n}(\mathbf{0})\otimes_{\mathscr{B}_{m,n-2}(\mathbf{0})} M \to M$ by setting $\alpha(D\otimes m) = (e_{n-1}D)_0 m$, where $(e_{n-1}D)_0$ is obtained from $e_{n-1}D$ by removing the horizontal arcs $\{n-1,n\}$ at the top and bottom rows of $e_{n-1}D$.

Suppose $D^* = s_{n-2}e_{n-1} \in J_{m,n}(\mathbf{0})$. Then $\alpha(D^*\otimes m) = m$. If $\phi \neq 0$, then there is an $m_1 \in M_1$ such that $\phi(m_1) = m_2 \neq 0$. Consequently, $\alpha(D^* \otimes m_2) = m_2 \neq 0$. We have $\phi_* \neq 0$ since $\phi_*(D^*\otimes m_1) = D^*\otimes m_2 \neq 0$. This completes the proof of (a).

(b) can be proved similarly as [13, 7.2]. We include a proof as follows. First. we claim as $(\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\mathbf{0}), W_{m,n-2k})$-modules

$$I^{k'}_{m,n}(\mathbf{0}) \cong J_{m,n}(\mathbf{0}) \otimes_{\mathscr{B}_{m,n-2}(\mathbf{0})} I^{k-1'}_{m,n-2}(\mathbf{0}). \tag{4.7}$$

For the simplification in exposition and notation, we omit $\mathscr{B}_{m,n-2}(\mathbf{0})$ in what follows.

Suppose $D_1 \otimes D_2 \in J_{m,n}(\mathbf{0}) \otimes I^{k'}_{m,n-2}(\mathbf{0})$. Let $e_{i,j} = \alpha\otimes 1\otimes\alpha$, where $\alpha \in P(n,1)$ contains a unique horizontal arc $\{i,j\}$. Define $e^{s,t}_{i,j} = t^s_i e_{i,j} t^t_i$. We claim that there is a dotted Brauer diagram D'_1 in $I^{1'}_{m,n}(\mathbf{0})$ such that $D_1\otimes D_2 = D'_1 \otimes e^{s_1,t_1}_{i_1,j_1}\cdots e^{s_{k-1},t_{k-1}}_{i_{k-1},j_{k-1}} D_2$, where $e^{s_l,t_l}_{i_l,j_l} \in \mathscr{B}_{m,n-2}(\mathbf{0})$, $1 \le l \le k-1$.

In fact, if the bottom row of D_1 contains a horizontal arc $\{i,j\}$, which is different from $\{n-1,n\}$ and if there are t dots at the left endpoint i of $\{i,j\}$, then we can find another horizontal arc $\{i',j'\}$ at the top row of D_1 such that there are s dots at the left endpoint i' of $\{i',j'\}$. Using vertical arcs $\{i,i'\}$ and $\{j,j'\}$ instead of the horizontal arcs $\{i,j\}$ and $\{i',j'\}$ in D_1, we get another dotted Brauer diagram $\tilde{D}_1$. We have $D_1 = \tilde{D}_1 e^{s,t}_{i,j}$. Note that the number of horizontal arcs in *top*$(\tilde{D}_1)$ is $k-1$ if the number of horizontal arcs in *top*(D_1) is k. Using this method repeatedly, we have $D_1\otimes D_2 = D'_1 \otimes e^{s_1,t_1}_{i_1,j_1}\cdots e^{s_{k-1},t_{k-1}}_{i_{k-1},j_{k-1}} D_2$.

Since $D_2 \in I^{k-1'}_{m,n-2}(\mathbf{0})$, the number of the horizontal arcs in the top row of the composite of $e^{s_1,t_1}_{i_1,j_1}\cdots e^{s_{k-1},t_{k-1}}_{i_{k-1},j_{k-1}}$ and D_2 is at least $k-1$. If it is bigger than k, then $e^{s_1,t_1}_{i_1,j_1}\cdots e^{s_{k-1},t_{k-1}}_{i_{k-1},j_{k-1}} D_2 = 0$ in $I^{k-1'}_{m,n-2}(\mathbf{0})$. If one loop occurs in the composite of $e^{s_1,t_1}_{i_1,j_1}\cdots e^{s_{k-1},t_{k-1}}_{i_{k-1},j_{k-1}}$ and D_2, $e^{s_1,t_1}_{i_1,j_1}\cdots e^{s_{k-1},t_{k-1}}_{i_{k-1},j_{k-1}} D_2 = 0$ since $\delta_i = 0$, $0 \le i \le m-1$. We have $D_1 \otimes D_2 = 0$. In the remaining case, $e^{s_1,t_1}_{i_1,j_1}\cdots e^{s_{k-1},t_{k-1}}_{i_{k-1},j_{k-1}} D_2 = w\cdot e_{n-3}e_{n-5}\cdots e_{n-2k+1}$ for some $w \in W_{m,n-2}$. Note that $e_{n-1}w = we_{n-1}$,

$$D_1\otimes D_2 = D'_1 \otimes e^{s_1,t_1}_{i_1,j_1}\cdots e^{s_{k-1},t_{k-1}}_{i_{k-1},j_{k-1}} D_2 = D'_1 w \otimes e_{n-3}e_{n-5}\cdots e_{n-2k+1}.$$

Since $\{n-1,n\}$ is the unique horizontal arc at the bottom row of D'_1, $D'_1 w = w_1 e_{n-1}$ for some $w_1 \in W_{m,n}$. Hence, $D_1\otimes D_2 = w_1 e_{n-1} \otimes e_{n-3}e_{n-5}\cdots e_{n-2k+1}$. We can identify $D_1 \otimes D_2$ with $w_1 e_{n-1}e_{n-3}\cdots e_{n-2k+1} \in I^{k'}_{m,n}(\mathbf{0})$ and vice versa. This proves $\dim_F U_0 = \dim_F I^{k'}_{m,n}(\mathbf{0})$, where $U_0 = J_{m,n}(\mathbf{0}) \otimes_{\mathscr{B}_{m,n-2}(\mathbf{0})} I^{k-1'}_{m,n-2}(\mathbf{0})$.

On the other hand, for any $\alpha \in I^{k-1'}_{m,n-2}(\mathbf{0})$, let α^0_2 be obtained from α_2 by adding two vertical arcs $\{n-1,n-1\}$ and $\{n,n\}$. The F-linear map $\phi : U_0 \to I^{k'}_{m,n}(\mathbf{0})$ sending $\alpha_1\otimes\alpha_2$ to $\alpha_1\cdot\alpha^0_2$ is surjective. Since $\dim_F U_0 = \dim_F I^{k'}_{m,n}(\mathbf{0})$, it muse be injective. By the definition of the product of two dotted Brauer diagrams in [13], we can verify that ϕ is a $(\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\mathbf{0}), W_{m,n-2k})$-homomorphism. This completes the proof of the claim.

By [13, (6.3)], $I^{k'}_{m,n}(\mathbf{0}) \otimes_{W_{m,n-2k}} S^{\lambda} \cong S^{(k,\lambda)}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} G(S^{(k-1,\lambda)}) &= \mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\mathbf{0})e_{n-1} \otimes_{\mathscr{B}_{m,n-2}(\mathbf{0})} (I^{k-1'}_{m,n-2}(\mathbf{0}) \otimes_{W_{m,n-2k}} S^{\lambda}) \\ &= (\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\mathbf{0})e_{n-1} \otimes_{\mathscr{B}_{m,n-2}(\mathbf{0})} I^{k-1'}_{m,n-2}(\mathbf{0})) \otimes_{W_{m,n-2k}} S^{\lambda} \\ &\cong I^{k'}_{m,n}(\mathbf{0}) \otimes_{W_{m,n-2k}} S^{\lambda} \cong S^{(k,\lambda)} \end{aligned}$$

□

The following theorem is Theorem A(b).

Theorem 4.8. *If $n \geq 2$, then $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\mathbf{0})$ is not (split) semisimple over F.*

Proof. First, we assume that n is even. A direct computation shows that the Gram matrix $\mathcal{G}_{\frac{n}{2},0}$ with respect to $\Delta(\frac{n}{2},0)$ is zero. In particular, $\det \mathcal{G}_{\frac{n}{2},0} = 0$. By [6, 3.8], $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\mathbf{0})$ is not (split) semisimple. Suppose n is odd. We have $n \geq 3$. By Lemma 4.5, there is a non-zero $\phi \in \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathscr{B}_{m,3}(\mathbf{0})}(\Delta(k,\mu), \Delta(1,\lambda))$, where $\lambda = ((1),0,0,\cdots,0) \in \Lambda^{+}_{m}(1)$. Write $n = 3+2l$ for some $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Applying Proposition 4.6 l times, we get a non-zero homomorphism from $\Delta(k+l,\mu)$ to $\Delta(1+l,\lambda)$. By [6, 3.8], $\mathscr{B}_{m,n}(\mathbf{0})$ is not (split) semisimple. □

In order to complete the proof of Theorem A(a), we need verify $\tilde{\rho}_{m,n} = \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{m,n}$.

Proposition 4.9. *Suppose $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq 2$.*

(1) $\tilde{\rho}_{2,n} = \tilde{\rho}_{1,n} = \{k \in \mathbb{Z} \mid 3-n \leq k \leq n-3\} \cup \{2k-3 \mid 3 \leq k \leq n, k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$.
(2) $\tilde{\rho}_{m,n} = \tilde{\rho}_{1,n} \cup \{2-n, n-2\}$ *if* $m \geq 3$.

Proof. First, we assume $m = 2$. If $\mu \in \Lambda^{+}_{m}(n-2)$ and $\lambda \in \mathscr{A}(\mu)$, then either $\lambda^{(1)} = \mu^{(1)}$, $\lambda^{(2)} \in \mathscr{A}(\mu^{(2)})$ or $\lambda^{(2)} = \mu^{(2)}$, $\lambda^{(1)} \in \mathscr{A}(\mu^{(1)})$. We can assume $\lambda^{(1)} \in \mathscr{A}(\mu^{(1)})$ without loss of generality. Suppose $|\mu^{(1)}| = k$. Then k can be any integer between 0 and $n-2$. If $r = \sum_{p \in Y(\lambda/\mu)} c(p)$, then $r \in \tilde{\rho}_{1,n}$, forcing $\tilde{\rho}_{2,n} \subset \tilde{\rho}_{1,n}$. Identifying $\lambda \in \Lambda^{+}(k)$ with bipartition $(\lambda, (n-k))$, we have $\tilde{\rho}_{2,n} \supset \tilde{\rho}_{1,n}$. This proves the first equality in (1). Following [11], we define

$$\mathbb{Z}(n) = \left\{ r \in \mathbb{Z} \mid r = 1 - \sum_{p \in Y(\lambda/\mu)} c(p), \lambda \in \Lambda^{+}(k), \mu \in \Lambda^{+}(k-2), 2 \leq k \leq n \right\},$$

where two boxes in $Y(\lambda/\mu)$ are not in the same column. By [12, 2.4],

$$\mathbb{Z}(n) = \{ i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid 4-2n \leq i \leq n-2 \} \setminus \{ i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid 4-2n < i \leq 3-n, 2 \nmid i \}.$$

Therefore, the second equality in (1) follows.

Suppose $m \geq 3$. If μ and λ satisfy one of the conditions in Theorem 2.9(1) and Theorem 2.9(4), then $\sum_{p \in Y(\lambda/\mu)} c(p) \in \tilde{\rho}_{1,n}$. If μ and λ satisfy the conditions (2) or (3) in Theorem 2.9, then there is an i, such that $\mu^{(i)} \to \lambda^{(i)}$ and $\mu^{(m-i)} \to \lambda^{(m-i)}$. In this situation, $\sum_{p \in Y(\lambda/\mu} c(p) \in \mathfrak{T}_a + \mathfrak{T}_b$ with $|\mu^{(i)}| = a$ and $|\mu^{(m-i)}| = b$, where

- $\mathfrak{T}_a = \{ \sum_{p \in Y(\lambda/\mu)} c(p) \mid \mu \in \Lambda^{+}(a), \mu \to \lambda \}$, and
- $\mathfrak{T}_a + \mathfrak{T}_b = \{ i \mid i = x + y, x \in \mathfrak{T}_a, y \in \mathfrak{T}_b \}$.

Note that we can choose a suitable μ such that $a+b=i$ for all $i, 0 \le i \le n-2$. We claim

$$\mathfrak{T}_a = \begin{cases} \{0\}, & \text{if } a=0,\\ \{i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid -a \le i \le a\} \setminus \{0\}, & \text{if } a=1,2,\\ \{i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid -a \le i \le a\}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

In fact, one can verify the above result directly when $a \in \{0,1,2,3\}$.

Suppose $\mu \in \Lambda^+(k+1)$ and $\mu \to \lambda$. If λ has at least two removable nodes, then we can find a box q which is a removable node for both λ and μ. Let $\tilde{\lambda}$(resp. $\tilde{\mu}$) be obtained from λ (resp. μ) by removing q. Then

$$\sum_{p \in Y(\lambda/\mu)} c(p) = \sum_{p \in Y(\tilde{\lambda}/\tilde{\mu})} c(p) \in \mathfrak{T}_k = \{-k \le i \le k\},$$

the last equality follows from the induction assumption.

If λ has a unique removable node, then $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_r)$ with $\lambda_i = \lambda_j$, $1 \le i,j \le r$. We have $\sum_{p \in Y(\lambda/\mu)} c(p) = \lambda_1 - r$. Note that $-1-k \le \lambda_1 - r \le k+1$. In any case, we have $\mathfrak{T}_{k+1} \subset \{i \in Z \mid -1-k \le i \le 1+k\}$.

Conversely, by the induction assumption, we can write $i = \sum_{p \in Y(\lambda/\mu)} c(p)$, for some $\lambda \in \Lambda^+(k+1)$ and $\mu \to \lambda$ if $-k \le i \le k$. Since any Young diagram of a partition has at least two addable nodes, we can choose an addable node q for both λ and μ such that q and λ/μ are not in the same row. In other words, $i \in \mathfrak{T}_{k+1}$. We have

- $\sum_{p \in Y(\lambda/\mu)} c(p) = -(k+1)$ if $\lambda = (1, \cdots, 1) \in \Lambda^+(k+2)$ and $\mu = (1, \cdots, 1) \in \Lambda^+(k+1)$.
- $\sum_{p \in Y(\lambda/\mu)} c(p) = k+1$ if $\lambda = (k+2)$ and $\mu = (k+1)$.

Consequently, $\mathfrak{T}_{k+1} \supset \{i \in Z \mid -k-1 \le i \le k+1\}$. This completes the proof of the claim. Therefore,

$$\cup_{0 \le a+b \le n-2} T_a + T_b = \{i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid 2-n \le i \le n-2\}.$$

Note that $i \in \tilde{\rho}_{1,n}$ if $3-n \le i \le n-3$. (2) follows immediately. □

Proof of Theorem A(a) and (c): Theorem A(a) follows from Theorem 4.4 and Proposition 4.9. Theorem A(c) follows from Maschke's theorem.

References

[1] S. Ariki and K. Koike, *A Hecke algebra of* $(\mathbb{Z}/r\mathbb{Z}) \wr \mathfrak{S}_n$ *and the construction of its irreducible representations*, Adv. Math. **106** (1994), 216-243.

[2] R. Brauer, *On algebras which are connected with the semisimple continuous groups,* Ann. of Math. **38** (1937), 854-872.

[3] W. Brown, *The semisimplicity of* ω_f^n, Ann. of Math. **63** (1956), 324-335.

[4] W. Doran, D. Wales and P. Hanlon, *On the semisimplicity of the Brauer centralizer algebras*, J. Algebra **211** (1999), 647–685.

[5] J. Du and H. Rui, *Specht modules for Ariki-Koike algebras*, Comm. Algebra **29** , (2001), 4710-4719.

[6] J. Graham and G. Lehrer, *Cellular algebras*, Invent. Math. **123** (1996), 1-34.

[7] P. Hanlon and D. Wales, *Computing the discriminants of Brauer's centralizer algebras*, Math. Comp. **54** (1990), 771–796.

[8] T. Hungerford, *Algebra*, GTM73.

[9] H. R. Morton and A. J. Wassermann, *A basis for the Birman-Murakami-Wenzl algebra* , unpublished paper, (2000).

[10] Reinhard Haering-Oldenburg, *Cyclotomic Birman-Murakami-Wenzl algebras*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **161** (2001), no. 1-2, 113–144.

[11] H. Rui, *A criterion on the Semisimple Brauer algebras*, J. Comb. Theory (Ser. A) **1**11 (2005), 78–88.

[12] H. Rui and M. Si, *A criterion on the semisimple Brauer algebras, II*, J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A, (113) (2006), 1199-1203.

[13] H. Rui and W. Yu, *On the semi-simplicity of the cyclotomic Brauer algebras*, J. Algebra, **277**, (2005), 187-221.

[14] H. Wenzl, *On the structure of Brauer's centralizer algebras*, Ann. of Math. **128** (1988), 173-193.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, EAST CHINA NORMAL UNIVERSITY, 200062 SHANGHAI, P.R. CHINA.
E-mail address: `hbrui@math.ecnu.edu.cn`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, EAST CHINA NORMAL UNIVERSITY, 200062 SHANGHAI, P.R. CHINA.
E-mail address: `52060601009@student.ecnu.edu.cn`